STAT	Approved For Release 2005/11/21: CIA-RDP78B0477 002900020061-3  Repende Copy July 21, 1964  Japan L. Copy July 21, 1964	
	ULAR TUBE MAGNIFIER	
STAT	Declass Revi	ew by NGA
	The enclosed letter from	STA
STAT	If you think concepts are appropriate and worth considering, they will go into the second phase of the proposal which would rough out the design approach and performance and give an order of magnitude of cost. If that, in turn, looks good, they would then prepare a definitive priced proposal.	
	In order for a three-stage procedure to be successful, it is necessary for you to comment at each stage to provide guidance and direction for the following stage. Such comments are valuable for illuminating and clarifying the thinking on both sides.	
	1. Is the 1/2" field mentioned by good or marginal? Are extraordinary means desirable to obtain an even wider field of view?	STA
	2. Is it important to get more than 67 lines per millimeter resolution at the object or is that adequate?	
	3. With respect to distortion, color fringing, and brightness, what do you consider the best existing magnifier? What microscope do you consider as a performance standard?	
STAT	did not discuss the 20x magnifier. Do you want separate comments on that or will you assume for the present a direct scaling from 10x?	

## Binocular Tube Magnifier

July 21, 1964

4. The mechanics of the magnifier were not discussed. They are intimately related to the detail design approach and must necessarily be defined later. The next stage proposal would probably only discuss a general arrangement and overall dimensions. What specifically do you dislike about existing magnifiers?

does not have a product line of tube magnifiers such a others. While their approach may have some fresh ideas, they will have to start from the beginning with a custom design. As such, the prototype may be more costly, so do you consider it worthwhile for them to continue the proposal effort?

STAT

STAT

Enc.

STAT